

From: Spencer Hovekamp <Spencer.Hovekamp@noaa.gov>
To: Return requested <LAGERLOEF.MARCIA@epamail.epa.gov...>
Date: 7/10/97 11:45am
Subject: Re: Review of Washington water quality standards revisions

Marcia - Well, I'll try to give you an informative answer, if not an entirely satisfying one. Phil works for the NMFS Northwest Science Center (NWSC). The NWSC is our hard science resource/service. They are organizationally fairly distant from the "operations" Divisions of Northwest Region (NWR) NMFS, and don't know much about Section 7 of the ESA. You were mighty warm with Matt Longenbaugh, who I think misdirected you slightly by referring you to Steve Morris instead of his own supervisor, Steven Landino. Steve Morris is the Portland Field Office (PFO) Supervisor with responsibility for Section 7 within Oregon (Jeff Lockwood's supe). Steven Landino is the Olympia Field Office (OFO) Supervisor (Dennis Carlson's supe) with responsibility for Section 7 within Washington and is your most appropriate contact for your issue below. Steven & Steve, along with Ted Meyers, Boise Field Office (BFO) Supervisor (Bob Ries's supe), and myself (nobody's supe) all answer directly to Elizabeth Gaar, NWR Habitat Division Director. Elizabeth's peer, Brian Brown, is the Hydropower Division Director with responsibility for Section 7 on the mainstem Columbia and Snake Rivers. So the bottom line of contacts for your use would be:

Mainstem Columbia & Snake, Brian Brown, 503-230-5417.
Washington State, Steven Landino, 360-753-6054.
Oregon, Steve Morris, 503-231-2224.
Idaho, Ted Meyers, 208-378-5698.
NWR Policy Issues, Spencer Hovekamp, 503-231-2378.

All e-mail addresses have identical format:
firstname.lastname@noaa.gov

As we all agreed at the Boise workshop, early involvement is the way to go and, in principle, we want to do that. However, we are inextricably stuck in a crisis of insufficient staff. The reality is that if your issue doesn't rank very near the top of our workload priorities, it may not get addressed immediately. I expect that once we have a CWA/Section 7 Streamlining Agreement in place, we will be able to project a workload and allocate sufficient staff time. I'm sorry I can't offer you a more helpful reply. Hang in there and keep up the good work! - Spencer

Reply Separator

Subject: Review of Washington water quality standards revisions
Author: LAGERLOEF.MARCIA@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV at EXTERNAL
Date: 7/8/97 4:38 pm

Washington's Department of Ecology has proposed water quality standards revisions out at public notice now, with a closing date of July 18. The package is a mixed bag: lake phosphorus criteria; revisions to the marine copper and cyanide criteria; revisions to the ammonia criteria; changes in how they allow exceedances of standards for dredging, application of aquatic pesticides, and spills at dams (TDG exceedances); and addition of "wetlands" to their definition of waters of the state, as well as some specifics on how to protect wetlands. NOW is when NOAA and EPA can most effectively affect what the state ultimately adopts, by commenting on the proposals. I agreed

7/15
left for
message

Duplicate

in Boise I would give Service staff a heads-up at times like this, rather than asking them to track every bit of the development of standards. I think your folks should look at the copper and cyanide changes as well as the provision for standards exceedances, however I can't locate who the key individual would be. I've talked to Matt Longenbaugh (sp?) in Olympia, who tells me he's got all his time committed on HCPs and Phil Roni at the Montlake lab (who is on Washington's technical committee for changes to their water classification for fish). Matt referred me to Steve Morris, so I left him a message over a week ago, with no response. Phil sent an e-mail to Elizabeth Gaar asking who should have the lead on this and giving her my name and number. I haven't heard from her either. Can you help out? I simply need a person identified who will be my lead NMFS contact for the Washington WQS review. After the state completes the current revisions (Phase 1), which they hope to adopt in September, they will go to public workshops in the winter with the more complex pieces (Phase 2), which include antidegradation implementation procedures and a new system for classifying their waters, including more protective temperature criteria for salmonids. In other words, there will be some ongoing action now on Washington WQS over the next year. I've been trying hard with this state to get ahead of the curve and identify the ESA concerns BEFORE the WQS are adopted, so that we won't have to disapprove (which is turning into a messy process in Idaho). All I want at this point is an indication of whether NMFS sees any show stoppers in what Washington is proposing in Phase 1. Thanks for any help you can give in sorting out the contact. I'll be glad to work with whomever it is to walk them through the changes.

CC: Return requested <martin.don@epamail.epa.gov>